

Before the  
Administrative Hearing Commission  
State of Missouri



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,  
STATE COMMITTEE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS,

Petitioner,

vs.

BARBARA LEE,

Respondent.


Case No. 90-000260PS

ORDER OF DISPOSITION

On August 16, 1990, the parties filed with this Commission a "Joint Stipulation of Facts, Waiver of Hearings Before the Administrative Hearing Commission and Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists, and Consent Order with Joint Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law." Upon review of this document, the Commission finds that the parties have knowingly and voluntarily entered into a settlement in this matter and have freely waived their right to a hearing before this Commission and to a subsequent disciplinary hearing before the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists. Further, upon review of the facts of the joint stipulation, agreed to by Respondent and therefore found to be true, it is the independent finding of this Commission that cause exists for Petitioner to take disciplinary action against Respondent's license under Section 337.035.2(5), (6), (11), (13), RSMo 1986. Based upon this finding of cause for discipline, therefore, this Commission approves the agreement of the parties set forth in the attached joint stipulation.

Accordingly, this Commission, pursuant to 1 CSR 15-2.150(1), adopts the terms of the Joint Stipulation of Facts, Waiver of Hearings Before the Administrative Hearing Commission and Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists, and Consent Order with Joint Proposed Findings Of Fact and Conclusions of Law filed by the parties. It is therefore ordered that this case be dismissed from this Commission's docket, effective this date.

DATED this 21 day of August, 1990

  
PAUL M. SPINDEN  
Commissioner

FILED

AUG 16 1990

BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING COMMISSION  
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING COMMISSION  
STATE OF MISSOURI

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
STATE COMMITTEE OF PSYCHOLOGISTS  
3523 North Ten Mile Drive  
P.O. Box 4  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Petitioner,

v.

BARBARA LEE  
P.O. Box 280  
Graniteville, Vermont 05654

Respondent.

No. 90-000260PS

JOINT STIPULATION OF FACTS, WAIVER OF HEARINGS BEFORE  
THE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING COMMISSION AND DEPARTMENT  
OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, STATE COMMITTEE OF  
PSYCHOLOGISTS, AND CONSENT ORDER WITH  
JOINT PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT  
AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Pursuant to the rules governing practice and procedure before the Administrative Hearing Commission (1 CSR 15-2.150(1)) and pursuant to the terms of § 536.060, RSMo 1986, as it is made applicable to the Administrative Hearing Commission by § 621.135, RSMo 1986, the parties waive the right to a hearing and decision of the above-styled case by the Administrative Hearing Commission, and, additionally, the right to a disciplinary hearing before the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists under § 621.110, RSMo 1986, and stipulate and agree that a final disposition of this matter may be effectuated as described below.

I.

1. Respondent, Barbara Lee, acknowledges that she understands the various rights and privileges afforded her by law, including the right to a hearing of the charges against her; the right to appear and be represented by legal counsel; the right to have all charges against her proven upon the record by competent and substantial evidence; the right to cross-examine any witnesses appearing at the hearing against her; the right to a decision upon the record by a fair and impartial administrative hearing commissioner concerning the charges pending against her; and subsequently, the right to a disciplinary hearing before the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists at which time she may present evidence in mitigation of discipline. Being aware of these rights provided her by operation of law, the respondent knowingly and voluntarily waives each and every one of these rights, and freely enters into this Joint Stipulation of Facts, Waiver of Hearings Before the Administrative Hearing Commission and Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists, and Consent Order with Joint Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and agrees to abide by the terms of this document, as they pertain to her.

2. Respondent acknowledges that she has received a copy of the First Amended Complaint filed with the Administrative Hearing Commission in this cause. For the purpose of settling this dispute, and not as an admission of guilt, Barbara Lee

stipulates that the factual allegations contained in the First Amended Complaint are true and stipulates with petitioner that her license as a psychologist, numbered 01229, is subject to disciplinary action by the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 621 and § 337.035, RSMo 1986.

3. For purposes of resolving this administrative matter, respondent does not contest or admit the validity or accuracy of the allegations contained in the First Amended Complaint filed with the Administrative Hearing Commission in this cause, but for the purpose of resolving this administrative matter, respondent stipulates with petitioner that respondent's license as a psychologist, numbered 01229, is subject to disciplinary action by the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 621 and § 337.035.2, RSMo 1986.

4. Based upon the foregoing, petitioner and respondent jointly stipulate to the following and request that the Administrative Hearing Commission adopt the Joint Proposed Findings of Fact and the Joint Proposed Conclusions of Law as the Administrative Hearing Commission's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

## II.

### Joint Proposed Findings of Fact

1. Petitioner, Department of Economic Development-State Committee of Psychologists, is an agency of the state of Missou-

ri created and established pursuant to Section 337.050, RSMo, for the purpose of administering and enforcing the provisions of Chapter 337, RSMo, as it pertains to psychologists and the practice of psychology.

2. The respondent, Barbara Lee, is licensed by the State Committee of Psychologists. The respondent's Missouri license, numbered 01229, was issued to the respondent on August 7, 1986, and has been current and active since that date.

3. As a prerequisite to licensure as a psychologist in the state of Missouri, pursuant to Section 337.050, RSMo 1986, each applicant must be at least 21 years of age, and of good moral character; and, further, for applicants applying for licensure based on a doctoral degree in psychology, each applicant must have had at least one year of satisfactory post-degree supervised professional experience.

4. Section 337.020.2, RSMo 1986 (Supp. 1989), states, in pertinent part:

2. Each applicant shall submit evidence satisfactory to the department that he is at least twenty-one years of age, is of good moral character, has had at least one year of satisfactory supervised professional experience in the general field of psychology, as defined by rule, and . . .

5. 4 CSR 235-2.020 states, in pertinent part:

(3) As applied to periods of supervision commencing on or after January 1, 1984, and on or before December 31, 1988, the phrase "satisfactory supervised professional experience in the general field of psychology" as used in section 337.020.2, RSMo shall mean post-degree training or practice of psychology obtained under the supervision of a li-

censed psychologist who is not a relative of the trainee. This one (1) year of supervised professional experience must be acquired in an organized health service training program; however, an applicant may obtain, with prior approval by the committee, this experience in a setting other than an organized health service training program. If the applicant desires this special approval, he shall have his supervisor submit a written detailed description of the proposed program of supervised professional experience. The psychological activities of the applicant must be performed pursuant to the supervisor's order, control, and full professional responsibility. Professional reports prepared by the applicant during the period of the professional experience must be co-signed by the supervisor. The supervisor shall maintain a continuing relationship with the applicant and must meet with the applicant a minimum of one (1) hour per week in face-to-face individual supervision. Group supervision is not acceptable for supervised professional experience under this regulation. The supervisor must certify to the department that the applicant has complied with these requirements for satisfactory professional experience.

6. In or around May of 1984 and continuing to in or around May of 1986, respondent engaged in supervised professional experience for the purpose of obtaining licensure in Missouri as a psychologist.

7. During this period of supervised professional experience respondent was engaged in the practice of psychology and entered into psychologist/patient relationships with clients.

8. During this period of supervised professional experience respondent was supervised, at different times, by Dr. Kenneth Hall and Dr. John Stefanowicz.

9. 4 CSR 235-5.020(2) states: "Responsibility: In providing services, psychologists maintain the highest standards of their profession. They accept responsibility for the consequences of their acts and make every effort to ensure that their services are used appropriately."

10. 4 CSR 235-5.020(2)(F) states: "As practitioners, psychologists know that they bear a heavy social responsibility because their recommendations and professional actions may alter the lives of others. They are alert to personal, social, organization, financial, or political situations and pressures that might lead to misuse of their influence."

11. 4 CSR 235-5.020(3)(F) states, in pertinent part:

(3) Competence: The maintenance of high standards of competence is a responsibility shared by all psychologists in the interest of the public and the profession as a whole. Psychologists recognize the boundaries of their competence and the limitations of their techniques. They only provide services and only use techniques for which they are qualified by training and experience. In those areas in which recognized standards do not yet exist, psychologists take whatever precautions are necessary to protect the welfare of their clients. They maintain knowledge of current scientific and professional information related to the services they render.

.....

(F) Psychologists recognize that personal problems and conflicts may interfere with professional effectiveness. Accordingly, they refrain from undertaking any activity in which their personal problems are likely to lead to inadequate performance or harm to a client, colleague, student, or research participant. If engaged in such activity when they become

aware of their personal problems, they seek competent professional assistance to determine whether they should suspend, terminate, or limit the scope of their professional and/or scientific activities.

12. 4 CSR 235-5.020(4) states:

Moral and Legal Standards: Psychologists' moral and ethical standards of behavior are a personal matter to the same degree as they are for any other citizen, except as these may compromise the fulfillment of their professional responsibilities or reduce the public trust in psychology and psychologists. Regarding their own behavior, psychologists are sensitive to prevailing community standards and to the possible impact that conformity to or deviation from these standards may have upon the quality of their performance as psychologists. Psychologists are also aware of the possible impact of their public behavior upon the ability of colleagues to perform their professional duties.

13. 4 CSR 235-5.020(7) states, in pertinent part: "Welfare of the Consumer: Psychologists respect the integrity and protect the welfare of the people and groups with whom they work."

14. 4 CSR 235-5.020(7)(A) states:

(A) Psychologists are continually cognizant of their own needs and of their potentially influential position vis-a-vis persons such as clients, students, and subordinates. They avoid exploiting the trust and dependency of such persons. Psychologists make every effort to avoid dual relationships that could impair their professional judgement or increase the risk of exploitation. Examples of such dual relationships include, but are not limited to, research with and treatment of employees, students, supervisees, close friends, or relatives. Sexual intimacies with clients are unethical.



15. 4 CSR 235-5.020(8)(D) states:

(8) Professional Relationships: Psychologists act with due regard for the needs, special competencies, and obligations of their colleagues in psychology and other professions. They respect the prerogatives and obligations of the institutions or organizations with which these other colleagues are associated.

(D) Psychologists do not exploit their professional relationships with clients, supervisees, students, employees, or research participants sexually or otherwise. Psychologists do not condone or engage in sexual harassment. Sexual harassment is defined as deliberate or repeated comments, gestures, or physical contacts of a sexual nature that are unwanted by the recipient.

16. Section 337.035, RSMo 1986 (Supp. 1989), states, in pertinent part:

1. The department may refuse to issue any certificate of registration or authority, permit or license required pursuant to this chapter for one or any combination of causes stated in subsection 2 of this section. The department shall notify the applicant in writing of the reasons for the refusal and shall advise the applicant of his right to file a complaint with the administrative hearing commission as provided by chapter 161, RSMo.

2. The department may cause a complaint to be filed with the administrative hearing commission as provided by chapter 161, RSMo, against any holder of any certificate of registration or authority, permit or license required by this chapter or any person who has failed to renew or has surrendered his certificate of registration or authority, permit or license for any one or any combination of the following causes:

\*

\*

\*

(5) Incompetency, misconduct, gross negligence, fraud, misrepresentation or dishonesty in the performance of the functions or duties of any profession licensed or regulated by this chapter;

(6) Violation of, or assisting or enabling any person to violate, any provision of this chapter, or of any lawful rule or regulation adopted pursuant to this chapter;

\*

\*

\*

(11) Issuance of a certificate of registration or authority, permit or license based upon a material mistake of fact;

\*

\*

\*

(13) Violation of any professional trust or confidence;

\*

\*

\*

(15) Being guilty of unethical conduct as defined in "Ethical Standards for Psychologists" as adopted by the department and filed with the secretary of state.

17. In or around June of 1984, respondent, in her professional capacity as a psychologist in training, entered into a psychologist/patient client relationship with a client, J. Hood.

18. Respondent, in or around January of 1985, diagnosed J. Hood as having a multiple personality and formulated a treatment plan.

19. The treatment plan formulated by respondent conceptualized J. Hood as being a multiple personality who required complex therapeutic management in many areas of her life.

20. In or around October of 1984, and again in or around January of 1985, respondent hospitalized J. Hood.

21. In or around February of 1985, while J. Hood was a client of respondent, respondent began to have a social and personal relationship with J. Hood, which included activity outside the office. For example, respondent would drive J. Hood to AA meetings and attend the meetings with her; and on two occasions respondent permitted J. Hood to visit with her socially at her home.

22. In or around February of 1985, while J. Hood was a client of respondent, respondent admitted to J. Hood that she was attracted to her; and subsequently thereafter, respondent had a sexual encounter with J. Hood.

23. While J. Hood was a client of respondent, respondent entered into a sexual relationship with J. Hood.

24. In or around February of 1985, respondent moved in with J. Hood and continued to live and have a sexual relationship with Hood until in or around February of 1988.

25. Respondent did not advise petitioner of the conduct set out in paragraphs 17 to 24 above.

26. Petitioner was unaware of respondent's conduct, as set out in paragraphs 17 to 24 above, and thus issued to respondent a license to practice psychology based on a material mistake of fact.

27. Respondent misused the psychologist/patient relationship and caused potentially irreparable harm to her client.

28. Respondent did not adequately address her own personal problems which caused her to over-identify with her client's

similar issues and which interfered with respondent's ability to treat her client.

29. Respondent became involved in a sexual and romantic relationship with her client partially because respondent's own marriage was problematic, respondent had not faced her incest history or problems with sex and love addiction and thereby respondent blurred boundaries between her own personal issues and those of her client and blurred boundaries between the psychologist and patient roles. Respondent's judgment as a professional was influenced by countertransference.

30. The respondent's conduct in engaging in a sexual relationship with a client in her professional capacity as a psychologist constitutes misconduct and unethical conduct and violates the professional trust and confidence that the client placed in her as a psychologist, which professional trust and confidence is inherent in a psychologist/patient relationship.

31. Respondent's conduct, as set forth above, constitutes a violation of Sections 337.035.2, (5), (6), (11), (13) and (15), RSMo 1986 (Supp. 1989).

32. Respondent's conduct, as set forth above, constitutes a violation of 4 CSR 235-5.020(3)(F), 4 CSR 235-5.020(4), 4 CSR 235-5.020(7)(A) and 4 CSR 235-5.020(8)(D).

33. Respondent's conduct, as set forth above, constitutes a basis for denial of licensure; and if petitioner had been aware of the aforementioned conduct at the time of respondent's

application for licensure, respondent would have been denied licensure.

### III.

#### Joint Proposed Conclusions of Law

1. Respondent's conduct, as established by the foregoing, falls within the intendments of Section 337.035.2(5), (6), (11), (13) and (15), RSMo 1986 (Supp. 1989), which provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

2. The department may cause a complaint to be filed with the administration hearing commission as provided by chapter 161, RSMo, against any holder of any certificate of registration or authority, permit or license required by this chapter or any person who has failed to renew or has surrendered his certificate of registration or authority, permit or license for any one or any combination of the following causes:

(5) Incompetency, misconduct, gross negligence, fraud, misrepresentation or dishonesty in the performance of the functions or duties of any profession licensed or regulated by this chapter;

(6) Violation of, or assisting or enabling any person to violate, any provision of this chapter, or of any lawful rule or regulation adopted pursuant to this chapter;

(11) Issuance of a certificate of registration or authority, permit or license based upon a material mistake of fact;

(13) Violation of any professional trust or confidence;

(15) Being guilty of unethical conduct as defined in "Ethical Standards for Psychologists" as adopted by the department and filed with the secretary of state.

IV.

Joint Agreed Disciplinary Order

1. Based upon the foregoing, the parties mutually agree and stipulate that the following shall constitute the disciplinary order entered by the petitioner in this matter under the authority of § 621.110, RSMo 1986:

A. Effective ten (10) days after the date the Administrative Hearing Commission approves this order, Barbara Lee's psychology license, numbered 01229, shall be surrendered voluntarily and irrevocably, to the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists. Within ten (10) days after the Administrative Hearing Commission approves this disciplinary order, respondent Barbara Lee shall return her psychology license and wall-hanging certificate to the State Committee of Psychologists.

B. Effective ten (10) days after the date the Administrative Hearing Commission approves this order, Barbara Lee shall inform every state in which she is currently licensed, certified, registered or holding any other authority to engage in the practice of psychology or any mental health profession as to the terms of this disciplinary order; and Barbara Lee shall inform every state in which she is seeking or will seek licensure,

certification, registration or authority to engage in the practice of psychology or any other mental health profession as to the terms and conditions of this disciplinary order.

C. Upon the surrendering of Barbara Lee's psychology license, numbered 01229, effective ten (10) days after the date the Administrative Hearing Commission approves this order, and continuing for a period not less than three (3) years from the effective day of this disciplinary order, respondent shall be deemed ineligible and unqualified to be licensed as a psychologist in the State of Missouri; and respondent hereby agrees not to apply and shall not apply for licensure as a psychologist in the State of Missouri for a period not less than three (3) years from the effective day of this disciplinary order.

D. Upon the surrendering of Barbara Lee's psychology license, numbered 01229, effective ten (10) days after the date the Administrative Hearing Commission approves this disciplinary order, and continuing for a period not less than three (3) years from the effective day of this disciplinary order, respondent hereby agrees not to and shall not, in the state of Missouri, engage in any counseling, guidance, psychotherapy, or act which falls within the definition of the term "psychology" as set forth in Section 337.015.2, .3 and .4, RSMo Supp. 1989, whether a license is required for such acts or not.

E. At the end of the three year period referred to in paragraphs A, B, and C above, respondent shall be permitted to reapply for licensure as a psychologist in the state of Missouri. If respondent reapplies for licensure as a psychologist in the state of Missouri at the end of the aforementioned three (3) year period, she, subsequent to the effective date of this disciplinary order, shall have completed a three (3) semester hour graduate course in ethics for psychologists from a doctoral degree program approved by the American Psychological Association and shall have received a grade of B or better in said course; she must satisfy the educational, supervised professional experience and examination requirements in effect on the date of her reapplication; she shall not have committed an act for which a license may be denied under the law in effect on the date of her reapplication; she must satisfy and be in compliance with each and every term, provision and condition contained in this disciplinary order.

F. If, upon reapplication, the State Committee of Psychologists finds that respondent has successfully completed the three (3) hour ethics course referred to above, and further finds that respondent has satisfied the educational, supervised professional experience and examination requirements in effect on the date of her reapplication, and further finds that respondent has committed no act for which a license may be denied under



the law in effect on the date of her reapplication, and further finds that respondent has satisfied and is in compliance with each and every term, provision and condition of this disciplinary order, respondent shall be issued a new license to practice psychology in the state of Missouri; but said license shall be placed immediately on probation for a period of five (5) years. During the period of probation respondent shall pay all fees required for licensing and to maintain her license in a current and active state. During the period of probation, the respondent shall be entitled to engage in the practice of psychology, provided she adheres to all the terms of this Consent Order.

G. Should a new license be issued to respondent under the terms of this order, then during the period of probation, respondent shall keep the State Committee of Psychologists apprised at all times in writing of her current home and work addresses and telephone numbers at each place of employment.

H. Should a new license be issued to respondent under the terms of this order, then during the period of probation, respondent shall comply with all provisions of Chapters 337, RSMo, and all applicable federal and state drug laws, rules and regulations, and with all federal and state criminal laws. "State" here includes the state of

Missouri and all other states and territories of the United States.

I. Should a new license be issued to respondent under the terms of this order, then during the period of probation, respondent shall not serve in a supervisory capacity without prior approval of the State Committee of Psychologists.

J. Should a new license be issued to respondent under the terms of this order, then during the period of probation, respondent shall undergo a psychological evaluation by a licensed psychologist specializing in the practice of clinical psychology (hereinafter referred to as the "evaluating psychologist") approved by the petitioner within ninety (90) days following the date the period of probation becomes effective. Prior to undergoing a psychological evaluation with the evaluating psychologist, respondent shall submit to the State Committee of Psychologists a list of not less than five (5) licensed psychologists specializing in the practice of clinical psychology for its approval. A written evaluation concerning respondent shall be submitted by the evaluating psychologist to the State Committee of Psychologists within ninety (90) days from the date the period of probation becomes effective. It shall be the responsibility of the respondent to ensure that the evaluation is submitted by

the evaluating psychologist to the State Committee of Psychologists in a timely matter.

K. The State Committee of Psychologists will consider recommendations of the evaluating psychologist in making its recommendations regarding psychological testing, evaluation, supervision, therapy or other treatment that the State Committee of Psychologists finds appropriate for respondent. During the period of probation, respondent shall abide by the recommendations of the State Committee of Psychologists and shall engage in all psychological testing, evaluation, supervision, therapy or other treatment as deemed appropriate by the State Committee of Psychologists. The respondent shall bear the cost of all evaluations and all testing, evaluation, therapy, supervision, or other treatment.

L. Should a new license be issued to respondent under the terms of this order, then during the period of probation, respondent shall report to the State Committee of Psychologists in writing once every three (3) months, beginning on the date the new license issued, stating truthfully whether or not she has complied with all terms and conditions of this order.

M. Should a new license be issued to respondent under the terms of this order, then during the period of probation, respondent shall make herself available for a personal interview to be conducted by a member of the State

Committee of Psychologists or the Executive Director, State Committee of Psychologists to establish the respondent's progress during the period of probation. Respondent shall be given thirty (30) days notice before the date each and every personal interview is to be conducted.

N. Should a new license be issued to respondent under the terms of this order, then, during the period of probation, respondent shall advise in writing all of her clients that her license is currently on probation. Respondent shall advise her clients when the period of probation terminates. Within fifteen (15) days after the license is issued, respondent shall submit to the State Committee of Psychologists for its review, a copy of the writing respondent plans to submit to her clients advising them as to the action imposed. Before respondent submits any writing to her clients advising them of the action imposed, said writing shall be approved by the State Committee of Psychologists. Within ten (10) days after respondent advises in writing all of her clients as to the action imposed, respondent shall sign and submit to the State Committee of Psychologists an affidavit signed before a notary public swearing or affirming under penalties of perjury that she has provided written notification to her clients as to the action imposed.

O. Should a new license be issued to respondent under the terms of this disciplinary order, then during the

period of probation, respondent shall not engage in any counseling, guidance, psychotherapy, or act which falls within the definition of the term "psychology" as set forth in Section 337.015.2, .3 and .4, RSMo Supp. 1989, with any female, whether or not a license is required for such acts.

2. Should a new license be issued to respondent under the terms of this Consent Order, with the license being placed immediately on probation in accordance with the terms of this Consent Order, then upon the expiration of said five (5) years of probation, the respondent's license as a psychologist in Missouri shall be fully restored if all other requirements of law have been satisfied; provided, however, that in the event the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists determines that the respondent has violated any term or condition of this Consent Order, the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists may, in its discretion, vacate and set aside the discipline imposed herein, and may suspend, revoke or otherwise lawfully discipline the respondent.

3. No order shall be entered by the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists pursuant to the preceding paragraph of this Consent Order without notice and an opportunity for hearing before the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 536, RSMo.

4. If the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists determines that the respondent has violated a term or condition of this Consent Order, which violation would also be actionable in a proceeding before the Administrative Hearing Commission or the circuit court, the Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists may elect to pursue any lawful remedies or procedures afforded it and is not bound by this stipulation in its determination of appropriate legal actions concerning that violation.

5. In consideration of the foregoing, the parties consent to the entry of record and approval of this Joint Stipulation of Facts, Waiver of Hearings Before the Administrative Hearing Commission and Department of Economic Development, State Committee of Psychologists, and Consent Order with Joint Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and to the termination of any further proceedings before the Administrative Hearing Commission based upon the Complaint filed by the petitioner in this above-styled action.

RESPONDENT

Barbara Lee

Barbara Lee, Pro Se

P.O. Box ~~1195~~ 219

~~Whiteriver Junction, Vermont~~

05001 Richmond, VT 05477

Date: 8-14-90

PETITIONER

CARL KOUPAL, JR.

Director

Department of Economic  
Development

Tom Duncan

Tom Duncan

Director

Division of Professional  
Registration

Date: 8-14-90

Dennis Buckelew

Dennis Buckelew

Executive Director

State Committee of  
Psychologists

Date: 8-16-90

WILLIAM L. WEBSTER

Attorney General

L. Timothy Wilson

L. TIMOTHY WILSON

Assistant Attorney General

Mo. Bar Enrollment No. 37565

8th Floor, Broadway Building

P. O. Box 899

Jefferson City, MO 65102

(314) 751-8794

Attorneys for Petitioner